

is still refusing to acknowledge what happened and, instead, is attempting to rewrite history.

In a sense, even more appalling than Turkey's denial is the willingness of some officials in our own government to join in rewriting the history of the Armenian Genocide. It is vital that we do not let political agendas get in the way of doing what is right.

Mr. Speaker, the issues surrounding the Armenian genocide should not go unresolved. I call upon the United States Government to demand complete accountability by the Turkish Government for the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923.

To heal the wounds of the past, the Turkish Government must first recognize the responsibility of its country's leaders at that time for the catastrophe. Nothing we can do or say will bring those who perished back to life, but we can require them and bring everlasting meaning by teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to future generations.

The noted philosopher George Santayana has said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." We should heed this wise principle and do all we can to ensure that those that died, the people of the Armenian genocide, that these people are not forgotten.

VICE-PRESIDENT GORE'S VIEWS ON ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first in a series of special orders members of the Conservative Action Team and Western Caucus hope to hold on the record of Vice President AL GORE.

For the past 6½ years AL GORE has been Bill Clinton's point man on the environment and on a number of key issues. He has been particularly aggressive in attacking the work of congressional Republicans, often portraying the positions of congressional Republicans as being very extreme and very anti-people, if you will.

The members of the Conservative Action Team believe it is important for the American people to understand why AL GORE finds our record of cutting taxes, balancing the budget, eliminating wasteful government, and restoring commonsense environmental policies so contemptible, and to do this we think we must look at what AL GORE actually stands for.

Today we will examine the Vice President's views on the environment. This examination is important because, upon being elected, Bill Clinton ceded control of his administration's environmental policy to AL GORE. In fact, GORE was given the authority to select the EPA Administrator and other high-ranking environmental policy positions.

The timing of this special order also is important because tomorrow is Earth Day. Earth Day is a curious event, curious because we will not hear as much talk about protecting the environment, which all Americans support, as we will about what the Federal Government and Federal bureaucrats can do to curtail individuals' rights to use private property.

What makes Earth Day more curious is that the first such celebration took place in the 100th anniversary of communist revolutionary Vladimir Lenin's birthday.

One thing we have come to expect is that AL GORE will use Earth Day to criticize Republicans for not micro-managing every river, wetland, and estuary across America from Washington, D.C.

AL GORE's extreme views on the environment have not been given the attention they deserve, despite the fact that he has written an entire book explaining them. That book is entitled "Earth in the Balance," and I would encourage all of my colleagues to buy a copy and to read it. I think it will be most instructive. Let me just cite a couple of things out of the book in the limited time I have:

"The 20th century has not been kind to the constant human striving for a sense of purpose in life. Two world wars, the Holocaust, the invention of nuclear weapons, and now the global environmental crisis have led many of us to wonder if survival, much less enlightened, joyous and hopeful living, is possible. We retreat into the seductive tools and technologies of industrial civilization, but that only creates new problems as we become increasingly isolated from one another and disconnected from our roots."

Does any reasonable person really sit here and wonder if survival is even possible? I mean, this is unimaginable. And to compare this threat that he sees to the two world wars or to the Holocaust? And yet we live in a time of unimagined prosperity and a time when people in many ways are more well off than ever. I just think this is an interesting observation, to see that someone of this high office actually holds this kind of view which is so far out of the mainstream.

The Vice President made a statement about the future of cars, and that is in the book and I will quote within that. Mr. Speaker, I will end on this note: Within the context of the Strategic Environment Initiative, which I understand to be a proposal the Vice President has worked on, it sought to be able to establish a coordinated global program to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine over, say, a 25-year period.

Let me just observe, the internal combustion engine has been a great blessing to Americans and to people around the world. I have never really heard of an adequate replacement for it. And it has certainly been the

source, in the manufacture of that and related industries, that has created hundreds of thousands of jobs. And yet here the Vice President is essentially lauding the elimination of the internal combustion engine.

We will conduct further discussions on this in the weeks ahead.

TIME HAS COME FOR THE UNITED STATES AND IRAN TO HAVE DI- RECT COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Bruce Langden was a hostage in Iran with the takeover of the embassy; and as he has stated many times in the past couple of years, it is time for the two countries to talk.

It has now been 20 years since the United States and Iran have had any direct communications with each other. Official exchanges have all been indirect via the Swiss. Its embassy in Tehran today officially represents the American interests there. But these have been very rare and limited amounts of contact.

On the face of it, that fact makes little sense, for either country to not talk, given the way the interests of the United States and Iran in that part of the world overlap. We cannot ignore the reality of Iran. Neither can Iran ignore the reality of America's strategic interests and military presence today in the Persian Gulf.

We have some obvious shared interests. An improved situation in the Middle East is good for the world and good for us and good for Iran. We obviously also share interests of better control of traffic in narcotics in the region and freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf for everyone.

But the absence of dialogue with Iran inevitably impacts even more broadly on our strategic interest throughout the region. More specifically, Mr. Speaker, it complicates our relationship with the Central Asian states that evolved out of the former Soviet Union, with whom Iran has had historic cultural and strategic interests.

It also denies contact in commerce between the two countries, which can benefit many of the Iranian people and also the American people. It leaves the vast oil and gas sector of Iran, in serious need of infrastructure modernization and expansion, open to European interests but not to the Americans.

It also postpones the time when we inevitably will need to accept the reality of Iran's naval presence in the Gulf and the need for Iran to be included in essential long-term, multilateral security arrangements in those waters.

It denies us conduct with the emerging generation of future leaders in that country, particularly amongst the young people. Some 50 percent of Iran's population are under the age of 25, and

the educational exchanges between the two countries would be of benefit to everybody.

Now, we never are going to be able to communicate by saying, "These are the four points that we are unhappy with with Iran," and Iran saying to the United States, "These are the four points we are unhappy with." I think we simply have to agree to begin to talk and to communicate.

Now, regrettably, the Tehran government continues to assert that it is not open to dialogue except under conditions that make dialogue impossible; in other words, no dialogue from government to government. And it is clear that the continuing political confrontation in Iran between conservative elements and those preaching moderation makes overtures towards the U.S. unlikely soon.

We also have our own amounts of arguments in our democracy here about whether we should or should not commune. I am sure other Members of Congress would take a different point of view, Mr. Speaker, from what I am saying today.

But on our part, I think we need to make it clear that we are ready to communicate and agree to talk with each other. One immediate way to signal that interest would be for us to facilitate the license that would be needed under our current trade embargo for the sale of up to 500,000 tons of American agricultural commodities that American and Iranian private interests seek to complete. According to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman, the request remains under review.

Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in a speech at the Asia Society in New York, urged the reestablishment of relations between the two countries. Looking down the road, a restored relationship between Iran and the United States would find special strength in one important factor. The U.S. today is the second largest Persian-speaking country in the world.

Some million and a half Iranian Americans now live here in the United States. Many had fled the country or emigrated since the Iranian revolution. Like the many other ethnic minorities who make up our country, that is a special strength for the long term. Families should be able to go back and forth. Iranians should be able to visit their families here.

So I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by just saying that the time has come to at least begin to agree to communicate so that differences that we have can be brought to the table, and I think it will make for a better world and a better Mideast and more of a resolve to have peace on our planet.

U.S. POLICIES RESTRICT GROWTH OF CERTAIN EXPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues we face as a country and will continually face is the issue of economic growth, basic prosperity, creating an economy where all of our constituents can have good jobs that last and enable them to take care of themselves and their family.

We must always be thinking of ways to increase economic growth, to increase economic prosperity to provide those jobs. I think that is one of those basic and fundamental services that I think of myself providing for the people I represent in the 9th District of the State of Washington, is to try to help do what we can to encourage a strong economy, and one of the cornerstones of a strong economy is exports.

In order to create a possibility for economic growth, we have to have a strong export market, and a few basic facts make this point clear. Ninety-six percent of the world's population lives outside of the United States. But despite the fact we only make up 4 percent of the world's population, we consume 20 percent of the world's goods and services and products.

So we can basically look at those figures and realize that if we are going to have economic growth, it is probably going to have to occur outside of the United States. We are going to have to do something to get access to that 96 percent of the world that does not live here.

There is massive potential for growth in those markets for all of our products. Technology products, goods, services, you name it, exports are an incredible possibility for growth. Currently we have a number of policies in the U.S. that restrict the ability of those exports to grow, and that is what I want to address the House about today.

Now, there are some very good reasons for why these restrictions on exports exist. Unfortunately, as times have changed, those reasons are no longer valid, so it is very important that we reexamine our policy of restricting exports. And there are two that I want to touch on today. One is unilateral economic sanctions, and the second is restrictions that we police on the exportation of certain technologies, certain software and certain computers.

When we look at the issue of unilateral economic sanctions, it is important to first look at why we do it. We do it because we want to change the policies of other countries, policies that we are absolutely right in condemning and wanting to change, policies such as restrictions on religious freedoms, restrictions on democratic freedoms, restrictions on economic freedoms, and basic human rights concerns.

Unilateral economic sanctions are perceived as one way to get other countries to change those policies. But the problem is we live in a global economy, and in a global economy a unilateral,

which means only us, the U.S., placing export restrictions on our companies doing business with other countries, does not get us there because those other countries have dozens of other options. They can go to other countries and get their goods and services elsewhere, and all that happens is that we lose market share and those policies that we are concerned about do not change.

Economic sanctions, in order for them to work, must be multilateral in order for them to have full impact. I brought a chart with me today to show my colleagues, in red, the countries that we have placed some sort of economic restriction on. In other words, these are countries that there are some sort of restrictions on U.S. companies exporting to them. These are markets that we are shutting off or reducing access to for U.S. companies.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, the important point here is it just does not work. If it worked, if we could actually change human rights policy, change democracy policy, change economic repression through a policy of unilateral economic sanctions, certainly it would be worth doing it, but it does not work. We need to reexamine that policy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill in the House to do that sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who spoke earlier on this issue. I think it is critical that we support that.

On technology, we restrict it for a slightly different reason. We restrict it for national security concerns. Perfectly valid concerns, but the question is: Do our restrictions on encryption software and computers actually help national security? I would argue, first, that they do not and, second, that they actually hurt our national security interests.

This technology is not something we can put our arms around. It is growing so fast and in so many countries other than the U.S. We are not the only ones making encryption software in computers. Other countries are doing it. Therefore, these countries that we want to restrict access to will get access to it anyway. All we will do is hurt our own companies and hurt their ability to grow.

This is not a choice between commerce and national security. In fact, I would argue that our national security could be best enhanced by opening up these markets to our U.S. technology companies so that U.S. technology companies can continue to be the leaders in technology and, therefore, share that technology with our national security interests. We are not going to be able to get the sort of interplay back and forth between the private sector and our defense companies if Germany or Canada or any number of other countries suddenly is out in front of us in technology. We will lose our national security edge.

So, paradoxically, the policy of restricting the ability of our technology